

Remarks

Claims 1, 3-9, 11-17, and 19-20 are pending in the application and the same are rejected. Claims 1, 3-9, 11-17, and 19-20 remain in the application and are presented for review and further consideration by the Examiner.

The Examiner has rejected claims 1, 3-9, 11-17, and 19-20 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Bauer et al., U.S. Patent No. 5,819,047 and Savitzky et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,012,083. (Examiner's Action, page 2, ¶ 2).

Applicants respectfully disagree.

Bauer discloses tracking resource usage on a network. Quota limits are assigned to a user and tracked. As long as the quota limits have not been exceeded, the user may continue to access resources. The quotas are merely a way of tracking the quantity of resource usage for a particular user. Bauer does not disclose the quotas or quota limits being a receipt for a document.

The Examiner admits that Bauer does not teach copying the original receipt to the print job agent or updating the copy of the receipt to indicate the document was printed. Instead, the Examiner relies on Savitsky for these. However, the Examiner previously stated that the combination of Savitsky and Cavill do not teach the steps of "copying the original receipt for the document to the print job agent and updating the copy of the receipt to indicate the at least one page of the document was printed." (Examiner's Action 02/26/2003, page 3). Thus, Savitsky alone does not disclose these steps.

The Examiner cites col.10, lines 36-44 of Savitsky in support of the notion that Savitsky discloses copying the original receipt to the print job agent and updating the copy of the receipt to indicate the document was printed. The cited section of Savitsky discusses proxy agent 36 of agency 32 handling a document request either by requesting the document or generating a transaction, which causes the document to be retrieved. Not only is this transaction not copied from a previous location, but also neither is it updated. Savitsky does not disclose any of the transactions being copied or updated. Each transaction is generated and then handled.

Furthermore, in attempting to apply Savitsky to Bauer, the information considered by the Examiner as being the receipt is inconsistent. In Bauer, it is a quota for tracking resource usage and in Savitsky, it is a transaction for causing a document to be retrieved. Clearly one cannot copy a quota and end up with a transaction of the type disclosed by Savitsky. Therefore, together Bauer and Savitsky do not disclose an original receipt which is copied to a print job agent and updated to indicate a page of a document was printed.

In contrast, Applicants' independent claims 1, 9, and 17 include the wording "copying the original receipt to the print job agent" and "updating the copy of the receipt to indicate the at least one page of the document was printed." Neither Savitsky nor Bauer disclose these steps and neither do they disclose these steps when viewed together.

In view of Applicants' arguments with respect to independent claims 1, 9, and 17 being allowable, Applicants respectfully submit that the remaining dependent claims are also allowable because they contain all of the limitations of their respective independent claims and further add structural and functional limitations.

The foregoing arguments are believed to be a complete response to the most recent Examiner's Action.


No new matter has been added.

It is respectfully submitted that there is no claim, teaching, motivation, or suggestion in any of the cited art, alone or in combination, to produce what Applicants claim.

It is further submitted that the application as amended defines patentable subject matter and that the claims are in a condition for allowance. Such allowance at an early date is respectfully requested.

Should any issues remain which would preclude the prompt disposition of this case, it is requested that the Examiner contact the undersigned practitioner by telephone.

Respectfully submitted,
Shell S. Simpson and
James E. Clough

By 
Mark G. Pannell
Reg. No. 40,761

Date 4/27/04
(719) 260-7900